

1 Q Did you, when you were at the transmitter site,
2 see at the WJUX transmitter, say, this is a common site used
3 by WJUX FM and WVOS FM, is it not?

4 A I believe it is, yes.

5 Q Did you see a patch panel at that transmitter
6 site?

7 A I don't recall, no.

8 Q If there had been one, it would have been in the
9 building, enclosed there, housing the transmitters, would it
10 not?

11 A Right.

12 Q You entered that building, did you not?

13 A Yes.

14 Q In fact, do you recall observing remote control
15 equipment there, do you not?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q Remote control equipment typical of telephone dial
18 up remote control, is that right?

19 A Actually, more of the other type remote control,
20 higher level, dedicated remote control.

21 Q Not to revert to that subject again, but you made
22 observations while you were in the building, isn't that so?

23 A That's correct.

24 Q You did not see a patch panel, did you?

25 A There may have been one there. I mean, there's a

1 lot of wire.

2 Q I'm asking what you saw, not whether there may
3 have been one. Did you see one there?

4 A Not specifically, no.

5 Q Did you see one unspecifically?

6 A Unspecifically? I don't know what that question
7 means.

8 JUDGE STEINBERG: You didn't see one?

9 THE WITNESS: None that I can recall.

10 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.

11 MR. RILEY: All right.

12 BY MR. RILEY:

13 Q Now, you were speaking with Mr. Blabey, is that
14 right?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Your source of the belief that one had to go to
17 the WJUX FM transmitter site and affect a change of cabling
18 at the patch panel in order to be able to originate
19 programming from this main studio 15 minutes away from the
20 transmitter site is what Mr. Blabey told you, as you
21 understood it, is that right?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Now, do you know that Mr. Blabey's company
24 controls, his company being Mountain Broadcasting, controls
25 another radio station besides WVOS FM?

1 A Yes.

2 Q What is that?

3 A It's WVOS.

4 Q The AM station?

5 A AM and FM.

6 Q But, I say in addition to WVOS?

7 A Oh, in addition to?

8 Q It controls an AM station, WVOS, is that right?

9 A Okay, yes, that's my understanding.

10 Q Do you know where its transmitter is located?

11 A The AM transmitter, no, I do not.

12 Q Now, Ms. Montana said nothing to you pertinent to
13 the subject that we're talking about, which is the ability
14 to originate programming from the WJUX studios, is that
15 right?

16 A As far as I can recall.

17 Q When you were on the telephone with Mr. Turro, did
18 you ask Mr. Turro any questions about the ability of WJUX FM
19 to originate programming from his studio over in Ferndale?

20 A I don't believe --

21 Q About the ability to do so?

22 A I don't believe I did, no.

23 Q Now, one other matter that your report of the
24 April 13, 1995 inspection in Ferndale recites is this. I'm
25 looking at Mass Media Bureau, page 254 of its Exhibit 16, I

1 guess it is, page 254, the same page we had a moment ago.

2 A Okay, I have it.

3 Q Under this first paragraph that has a headline on
4 it, "WXTM Main Studio Location," the very last sentence
5 there, "No telephone line is set aside for WXTM calls, nor
6 is any line answered as WXTM."

7 I take it from other information you've provided,
8 which I think is not in the inspection report itself, but in
9 other information you provided Monticello Mountaintop, that
10 when you arrived in Ferndale, you, in seeking to locate
11 WXTM, called directory assistance and were given a telephone
12 number for WXTM, is that correct?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q When you called that telephone number, where was
15 it answered?

16 A In Dumont.

17 Q It is upon that that you base this statement in
18 your inspection report that there is no telephone line set
19 aside for XTM calls, nor is any line answered as WXTM, is
20 that correct?

21 A No, that's a result of a question to personnel at
22 Ferndale, New York.

23 Q Now, which person is it that you asked?

24 A Unfortunately, I don't remember. I don't recall.

25 Q Do you recall what that person told you?

1 A Yes, that there are no lines set aside for WXTM,
2 nor is any line answered as WXTM.

3 Q Now, when you called WXTM, they gave you a
4 telephone number listed for WXTM, is that right?

5 A That's correct.

6 Q That's April of 1995, the day of your inspection
7 April 13?

8 A That's correct.

9 Q So, there was a listing for WXTM?

10 A Oh, yes.

11 Q Did you ask to what address that number was
12 listed?

13 A No, I did not.

14 Q So, as far as you know, directory assistance
15 listed that number to an address on Old Route 17 in
16 Ferndale?

17 A It's possible.

18 Q I mean, you don't know differently?

19 A No, and the only thing I know is where the call
20 was answered.

21 Q That's what I understood. When the call was
22 answered in Dumont, you were treated courteously?

23 A Oh, yes.

24 Q They gave you the directions to the main studio?

25 A Yes.

1 JUDGE STEINBERG: When you called, did you
2 identify yourself as an FCC employee?

3 THE WITNESS: No, I did not.

4 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.

5 BY MR. RILEY:

6 Q You make note of something again, at page 254, Mr.
7 Loginow, and I direct your attention to this, again, in this
8 top paragraph under WXTM Main Studio Location, in the second
9 sentence here in the paragraph. The only reason I direct
10 your attention to it is that it's cited in the Hearing
11 Designation Order, in paragraph eight. It's the sentence
12 that says, "However, there were no signs on the outside of
13 the building to indicate to the public that it was a studio
14 for WXTM." Do you know of any rule ever published by the
15 FCC in force then, in April of 1995, that requires a radio
16 station to have a sign outside of the location of its main
17 studio, indicating that that was the main studio?

18 A I don't believe so, no. But, in view of the fact
19 there was such a huge sign for WVOX, I thought there may be
20 one similar for a co-located station.

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: There's no public notice to that
22 requiring a sign?

23 THE WITNESS: Oh, no, not at all. Not that I
24 know.

25 JUDGE STEINBERG: A policy statement?

1 THE WITNESS: None that I know of. It's just
2 rather peculiar.

3 BY MR. RILEY:

4 Q It is my belief, and I ask you this question, Mr.
5 Blabey and Ms. Montana readily identified themselves as
6 holding positions with WJUX, isn't that so?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Mr. Blabey identified himself to you as the person
9 holding the position of general manager of WJUX?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q Ms. Montana identified herself as being the public
12 affairs director or public service director of WJUX, is that
13 correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Ms. Montana described to you that she spent an
16 amount of time out of her work week on WJUX matters, is that
17 correct?

18 A Yes, that's correct.

19 Q Did you ask her what she did for WJUX?

20 A I didn't go into the exact details of her duties
21 for WJUX. I was sent to get the percentages.

22 Q Right. Did you take up there with you the
23 complaint filed by Universal, which had been sent to you or
24 CIB by Mr. Goldstein?

25 A I don't believe so, no.

1 Q But, you had seen it before you visited the
2 Ferndale location of WJUX?

3 A Yes.

4 Q You read it?

5 A Yes.

6 Q You understood the allegations that were made?

7 A Yes.

8 Q One of the allegations made was that this was an
9 unattended operation, isn't that so?

10 A I believe so.

11 Q Now, on the basis of your inspection and your
12 meetings with Mr. Blabey and Ms. Montana, you concluded, I
13 take it, that it was an attended operation? These were
14 employees of WJUX, who identified themselves to you as such,
15 is that right?

16 A Attended out of Dumont.

17 Q What were Mr. Blabey and Ms. Montana doing?

18 A Well, they weren't tending to the transmitter.

19 Q Is that what you understood the Universal
20 complaint to mean, when it said unattended, the transmitter
21 was not being controlled at Ferndale?

22 A Well, that's a large portion of it, yes.

23 Q I see, so we're back to the question of where the
24 transmitter was. Do you know whether there is any rule of
25 the FCC, and I have the rules that were in effect in 1995.

1 I have the rules that were in effect in April of 1995 with
2 me. Are you aware of any rule that says that a broadcast
3 station's transmitter operations may not be controlled from
4 a point other than its main studio?

5 A No, I'm not aware of any rule.

6 Q For purposes of just looking at the question of
7 remote control, control from Dumont, New Jersey would not be
8 prohibited by any rule of the FCC for a station operating in
9 Ferndale, New York, is that right?

10 A I don't believe so.

11 Q Since we're back at this point, one last question.
12 You don't know whether there was a dedicated telephone
13 circuit that is a number that accessed the circuit for
14 remote control of the WJUX FM transmitter by dial up
15 telephone? You don't know that, do you?

16 A I can only go with the statement that there is no
17 line set aside for WXTM. That was a direct question to the
18 person --

19 JUDGE STEINBERG: Now, we --

20 BY MR. RILEY:

21 Q What does that statement mean, that --

22 JUDGE STEINBERG: Are we talking about paragraph
23 one on page 254, location? Or, are we talking about the
24 paragraph on transmitter control, because the set aside
25 language is in relation to the location. So, is Mr. Loginow

1 answering your question about a line that a member of the
2 public can call up?

3 I understood your question to be whether Mr.
4 Loginow knew, well, let me ask. Mr. Loginow, do you know
5 for a fact that there was no telephone circuit dedicated to
6 controlling, by remote control, the WJUX transmitter?

7 THE WITNESS: No, I do not know that for a fact.

8 JUDGE STEINBERG: Whatever you know is based on
9 what Mr. Blabey told you?

10 THE WITNESS: That's correct. If there was such -

11 -

12 JUDGE STEINBERG: And what Mr. Turro told you?

13 THE WITNESS: Right.

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: Period, that's it?

15 THE WITNESS: If there was such a line, I can only
16 presume Mr. Blabey would have said so.

17 JUDGE STEINBERG: But, you don't know?

18 THE WITNESS: I don't know.

19 JUDGE STEINBERG: Of your own knowledge?

20 THE WITNESS: No, I don't know.

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: That's what your question was?

22 MR. RILEY: That really was my question, and I
23 think Mr. Loginow has a dual understanding of something else
24 that's in his report and that's what I wanted to see if we
25 were confused about.

1 BY MR. RILEY:

2 Q I understood this line in your first paragraph of
3 Bureau Exhibit 16, page 254 that we addressed a few moments
4 ago, Mr. Loginow, "No telephone line set aside for XTM calls
5 nor does anyone answer XTM," to be a reference to a line
6 such as the number you got from telephone information that
7 ended up being an answer to Dumont. That is a line members
8 of the public might use to call Ferndale, thinking that it
9 would be answered there at Ferndale, trying to reach WXTM,
10 not a line referred to in paragraph 4A that we addressed
11 before the break. Those would be two different telephone
12 circuits, would they not?

13 A Possibly, not necessarily.

14 Q Well, now, if the telephone that is answered WXTM
15 in Ferndale today or in Dumont is one that Mr. Helmick or I
16 or Judge Steinberg could call, that would not then be a
17 telephone circuit dedicated for remote control use, would
18 it?

19 A As long as the control operator, who was situated
20 in the room designated as the main studio, would have
21 control over the conversation, that would be no problem, in
22 my opinion.

23 Q So, the same number that could be used by any of
24 the aforementioned persons to call a radio station to
25 request that they play an Elvis Presley tune on the

1 dedication line, that same telephone number, which
2 identifies a unique telephone circuit, could be the number
3 used to remote control the station under this 1988 policy
4 statement, paragraph 4A.

5 A If the control operator in the studio had control
6 over it, yes.

7 Q Now, you never returned to Ferndale, is that
8 right?

9 A That's correct, never.

10 Q Even until as we speak --

11 A Until this moment.

12 Q You'd not been there before April 13, 1995?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q So, what you have told us about Ferndale and then
15 your understanding of what you found, your findings in
16 Ferndale, those are as of April 13, 1995?

17 A That's correct.

18 Q I understand that you did not try to originate
19 programming from that studio. You've told me that today.

20 A I didn't want to remove the programming from the
21 transmitter. It's my understanding if we would have
22 switched patch panels, there would have been nothing coming
23 out at all.

24 Q You did not test the equipment in that studio room
25 and run it into some dummy circuit to see whether the

1 equipment in the studio could have created programming
2 suitable for broadcasting?

3 A No, I did not. I had no reason to doubt Mr.
4 Blabey.

5 Q Well, we're done with that. You also did not test
6 from Ferndale to see whether the station could be remotely
7 controlled? Isn't that right? You did no test?

8 A There was nothing to test.

9 MR. ARONOWITZ: Objection, asked and answered.

10 JUDGE STEINBERG: No, no, that was a different
11 question. The first one was whether the equipment in the
12 studio was tested to see if it could originate programming,
13 even tested to the extent of it being dumped into a dead
14 circuit.

15 The second question was, you did not test from
16 Ferndale to see whether Ferndale could control the
17 transmitter remotely?

18 MR. ARONOWITZ: I was just confused.

19 (Pause.)

20 MR. RILEY: Your Honor, I may be done here. I
21 just want to run through some notes I have.

22 JUDGE STEINBERG: Let's go off the record while
23 Mr. Riley reviews.

24 (Discussion held off the record.)

25 JUDGE STEINBERG: Back on the record. Mr. Riley?

1 BY MR. RILEY:

2 Q The inspection, Mr. Loginow, you indicated when I
3 asked you this before, at Ferndale in the building may have
4 gone from two to three hours?

5 A Yes, something on that order, two, two and a half.

6 Q Somewhere in there. I'm not trying to be precise.

7 JUDGE STEINBERG: Was that from the time you got
8 to Ferndale to the time you left Ferndale, including the
9 visit to the transmitter?

10 THE WITNESS: That's excluding the visit to the
11 transmitter, if I understand the question.

12 BY MR. RILEY:

13 Q That was exactly my understanding. My question
14 was meant to be in Ferndale, and then you went to the
15 transmitter outside of the time period, the two to three
16 hours. The visit to the transmitter out there and back may
17 have been what, another 45 minutes?

18 A Maybe not even that, yeah.

19 Q While you were in Ferndale, you were offered, it
20 was suggested or offered to you that you might look at the
21 WJUX public inspection file and you declined, is that so?

22 A That's correct.

23 Q Were any questions that you asked of Mr. Blabey or
24 others you encountered there that day answered -- I'm not
25 getting at the quality of the answer or the accuracy of the

1 understanding either of the question or of the answer, but
2 did you find cooperative staff?

3 A Oh, sure, definitely.

4 MR. RILEY: I have no further questions of Mr.
5 Loginow.

6 JUDGE STEINBERG: Thank you. Now, technically,
7 Mr. Helmick has a right to cross-examine, but given the line
8 up of the parties, I don't know what are your druthers, Mr.
9 Helmick? Do you want to cross-examine or do you want to
10 huddle up with --

11 MR. HELMICK: I have some questions, but I'd
12 rather have Mr. Aronowitz than I. The questions that I
13 would have probably would be minor after him.

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: Given the line up of the
15 parties, it just makes sense, throughout the proceedings,
16 let's say Mr. Naftalin will present Mr. Turro, then we'll
17 have the cross-examination and you can have redirect, and
18 then if Mr. Riley wants to do a little bit of redirect. I
19 think it just makes sense to do it that way, but I wanted to
20 offer.

21 Mr. Aronowitz, do you want to take a break and get
22 your thoughts together, or do you want to just plow ahead?

23 MR. ARONOWITZ: I prefer to plow ahead. Can we go
24 off the record a second?

25 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes.

1 (Discussion held off the record.)

2 JUDGE STEINBERG: We're back on the record. Mr.
3 Aronowitz, redirect examination?

4 MR. ARONOWITZ: Okay.

5 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

7 Q I'm going to take this in no particular order.
8 I'm just going to kind of scatter shot some questions. I
9 want to try to keep them together by subject as much as I
10 can, but I've taken a lot of notes. So, if there's anything
11 that doesn't feel like it's flowing, hang with me a minute.

12 First of all, with respect to the April and May
13 investigations that you conducted at WJUX in Dumont and the
14 translators, the investigations that you conducted in April
15 and May, were those conducted at the behest of any
16 particular bureau of the Commission?

17 A I believe the only two bureaus involved were the
18 Wireless and the Mass Media Bureau.

19 Q To your knowledge, the July and August
20 investigations, were the July and August of '95 visits to
21 Dumont or the translators, was that initially prompted by a
22 request by the Mass Media Bureau?

23 A The July 31 was from the Wireless Bureau. The
24 next day, I don't specifically recall -- rather, the August
25 2, I don't recall what prompted that one.

1 Q But, if in one of your statements or the
2 interrogatories you made the statement that the April and
3 May investigations were at the behest of Mass Media Bureau
4 and the July and August visits or investigations were at the
5 behest of the Wireless Bureau, would you have a problem with
6 that?

7 A The July and August? Probably more specifically
8 the July 31 was a request of Wireless and the August 2 was
9 probably from the Mass Media Bureau. Again, I just don't
10 recall specifically.

11 Q During the course of any of these investigations,
12 April, May, July or August, what did you view your role as?
13 What was the role of an FCC inspector?

14 A My roles for these occasions were to gather
15 information as best as I could determine as a field
16 inspecting engineer and transmit that.

17 Q The fact that you did not necessarily issue a
18 notice of violation is not unusual in this case, is that
19 correct?

20 A Yeah, that's correct.

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: I'd caution you to watch the
22 leading. Some of it is pretty harmless, but I can
23 anticipate some of it won't be and if it's a question that
24 suggest the answer and the answer comes from your mouth or
25 the witness agrees, I don't know how much weight to give

1 that.

2 MR. ARONOWITZ: Okay.

3 JUDGE STEINBERG: But, if it comes out of his
4 mouth, then there's a whole lot more weight. So, I'd just
5 caution you to watch the leading.

6 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

7 Q Let me switch topics for a second. This morning,
8 Mr. Naftalin engaged in a lot of questions with respect to
9 the May 15, 1995 testing of the link. Do you recall those
10 discussions this morning?

11 A Do you mean the microwave?

12 Q Correct, the microwave link, Intercity MG-499?

13 A Correct.

14 Q I was a little confused and I want to make sure I
15 understand this correctly. With the use of the signal
16 generator, you were using the signal generator during these
17 tests?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q With the signal generator, did you determine
20 whether the Fort Lee translator was receiving the signal of
21 the Pomona translator?

22 A Yes, I determined to the best of my ability that
23 it was not receiving signals from the Pomona translator.

24 Q Let me ask that again.

25 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes, please.

1 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

2 Q You did your test presuming a receive antenna on
3 top of the Fort Lee translator, is that correct?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q If the Fort Lee receive antenna was actually
6 located in the basement, would that change your result?

7 A I believe it would not.

8 Q When you tested the signal generator on 951 MHz,
9 which is the frequency of the Intercity microwave link,
10 presuming the receive antenna on Fort Lee on the roof, what
11 was your result?

12 A That the programming was being received via the
13 link of 951.

14 Q In preparation for today, did you read Mr. Turro's
15 statement to account for what you saw on the roof?

16 A Yes, I did.

17 Q Specifically with respect to the operation of the
18 Intercity microwave link?

19 A Yes, I read that.

20 Q Do you recall what was said about the microwave
21 link?

22 A Apparently, it was saying there are two channels
23 on the microwave link, an audio channel and a digital
24 channel or one channel for controlling the transmitter.

25 Q Was that referred to as a telemetry?

1 A Yes, I would think so.

2 Q Did you read the part where Mr. Turro accounts for
3 what you might have seen?

4 A Yes, yes, I did.

5 Q Did you form an impression of that account?

6 A Yes, I did.

7 Q What was that impression?

8 A Well, the impression was that the description of
9 the system was without merit, and highly inconsistent with
10 good engineering practice and would --

11 Q Could you briefly describe in your own words what
12 you viewed the explanation as being?

13 A If I've read the description correctly, if the
14 telemetry signal portion of the signal on 951 link was lost,
15 that the audio portion would be sought on the 951 link, and
16 that is highly problematic. The test makes no sense, to go
17 to a source what -- that has just been suspected, highly
18 suspected of having a problem with.

19 Q In light of Mr. Turro's statement, in light of
20 what you did on the roof with the signal generator, i.e., I
21 think you testified that they were receiving, the Fort Lee
22 translator was receiving the signal of the link from the
23 signal generator test -- if, in fact, the signal generator
24 shut down the link for telemetry purposes, is it logical to
25 assume that the receipt antenna would pick up as a default

1 the link itself?

2 A No, it's not logical whatsoever.

3 Q So, it would be your conclusion that the link
4 being used as a fail safe for itself is illogical?

5 A That's correct. It's poor technical to design
6 something like that. It just wouldn't work.

7 MR. ARONOWITZ: Excuse me a second.

8 (Pause.)

9 JUDGE STEINBERG: Can you define telemetry for me,
10 what your understanding of that is?

11 THE WITNESS: Telemetry is -- well, I'd refer to
12 it also as just like digital or data. It's mainly data, is
13 what telemetry is.

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, so it's data being
15 transmitted --

16 THE WITNESS: Very simplistic data.

17 JUDGE STEINBERG: -- from microwave or --

18 THE WITNESS: Yes, the allegation is that Turro,
19 the way he describes it is there was telemetry coming from
20 the studios in Dumont to the translator at Fort Lee, to
21 control the transmitter of the portion of the translator off
22 and on.

23 JUDGE STEINBERG: What does that have to do with
24 the microwave?

25 THE WITNESS: Well, he was claiming he's sending

1 the telemetry signal on top of the microwave link. He
2 subdivided that one signal on 951 link into audio and into
3 telemetry, is what the claim is.

4 JUDGE STEINBERG: So like the programming that was
5 coming out of the radio would be on one portion of the
6 signal, and whatever data --

7 THE WITNESS: A data channel.

8 JUDGE STEINBERG: What kind of data gets sent?

9 THE WITNESS: Well, he's just saying the data was
10 used to control the transmitter, so very simple.

11 JUDGE STEINBERG: You don't need to be controlling
12 the transmitter constantly, do you? I mean, you set it and
13 then it goes.

14 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

15 JUDGE STEINBERG: Then, if it gets out of whack,
16 you reset it?

17 THE WITNESS: That's correct, also.

18 JUDGE STEINBERG: Didn't they used to get out
19 whack -- out of whack being my technical term --

20 THE WITNESS: Right, 30 years ago.

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: Because that's why you had to
22 read the meters every three hours or so?

23 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

24 Q In fact, if it was out of whack, could it even
25 find the audio link? Could it find the audio path?

1 A Probably not. There's just no way of knowing.
2 Depending on the exact problem.

3 Q But, just generally speaking?

4 A Generally speaking, it's just fanciful
5 descriptions of circuitry.

6 Q You later met with Mr. Turro in July and August of
7 '95 to look at the translators?

8 MR. NAFTALIN: Objection. I don't think he's
9 testified he met with Mr. Turro in July of '95. That's a
10 fact not in evidence.

11 MR. ARONOWITZ: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

12 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

13 Q In August, 1995, did you look at the translators
14 in question?

15 A Yes.

16 Q In the course of going to do those inspections,
17 did you have occasion to meet Mr. Turro?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Did you call him and let him know that you were
20 coming?

21 A Not before arriving at the translator site.

22 Q You just walked in and said, here, I am?

23 A Well, I walked into the translator and then I
24 called him.

25 Q How long between the time you called him did you

1 meet with him?

2 A He came there rather quickly. Maybe ten -- I
3 mean, more like 20 minutes.

4 Q Where was he coming from?

5 A Presumably Dumont.

6 Q But, you don't know?

7 A No.

8 Q Where did you call him?

9 A I called him at Dumont.

10 Q Did you talk to him on the phone at Dumont?

11 A Yes, he was probably located at Dumont.

12 Q How far is Dumont from Fort Lee?

13 A Milewise, not far. Five miles, at most.

14 Q When you were with Mr. Turro in August of '95, was
15 there any conversation with respect to the signal drop out
16 of May 15, 1995?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Who brought that up?

19 A Mr. Turro.

20 Q What did he ask you?

21 A He didn't ask so much as he was observing the fact
22 that there was a signal drop out on that date, and he was
23 just relating that.

24 Q So, he volunteered that?

25 A Yes.

1 Q Did he ask you any questions?

2 A Not specifically, no.

3 Q Did you form an impression from his asking the
4 question?

5 A My impression was that he seemed to be letting me
6 know that I was involved, that I caused the occurrence.

7 JUDGE STEINBERG: What are you talking about?
8 What signal drop out?

9 THE WITNESS: On my testing of May 15, when I was
10 on the roof, testing the three separate signals.

11 JUDGE STEINBERG: Right.

12 THE WITNESS: Mr. Turro was implying that I, that
13 he knew that I was up there doing that test.

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, you testified earlier on
15 May 15, you had signal generator and it had the certain
16 result --

17 THE WITNESS: Correct.

18 JUDGE STEINBERG: -- when you generated a signal
19 on the frequency used by the --

20 THE WITNESS: By the link.

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: -- microwave.

22 THE WITNESS: So, it was obvious --

23 JUDGE STEINBERG: So, basically, Mr. Turro
24 mentioned that to you --

25 THE WITNESS: Yes.